

**WEST VALLEY CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

May 9, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 4:01p.m. by Chairman Harold Woodruff at 3600 Constitution Boulevard, West Valley City, Utah

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Harold Woodruff, Jack Matheson, Karen Lang and Dale Clayton

ABSENT: Brent Fuller, Terri Mills and Phil Conder

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING DIVISION STAFF

John Janson, Steve Pastorik, Ron Weibel, Hannah Thiel and Lori Cannon

WEST VALLEY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF:

AUDIENCE

Approximately eight (8) people were in the audience.

ZONE CHANGE APPLICATIONS:

Z-10-2007

Zone Change 'A' to 'C-2'

Staff Presentation by Hannah Thiel, Planner I

Ms. Hannah Thiel presented the application.

Legal Authority

7-5-101 Zoning Amendments

Background

Raywang Corp is requesting a zone change from Agriculture to General Commercial at 2055 West 3500 South on 1.76 acres. Currently half of the property is zoned General Commercial and the other half is zoned Agriculture. This zone change would allow the entire parcel to have the same zoning.

The applicant has not submitted new plans for the piece of the property requested for a zone change. Raywang Corp is considering building a new building in the back of the property where they would move Kowloon Café (currently located on the front piece of property). The existing building housing Kowloon Café may be used for a different commercial use such as retail shops. Raywang Corp has indicated that they are open to ideas from the City in regard to the development of the piece of their parcel currently zoned Agriculture.

Planning Commission expressed concern for parking in the Study Session held on May 2, 2007. When plans for development at this location are submitted, staff will work with the property owner and applicant to work out parking requirements.

Discussion: Commissioner Lang suggested one row of parking on the west side of the building be eliminated to widen the road to the back.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Lang moved for approval with one row of parking on the west side of the building to be eliminated to widen the road to the back property.

Commissioner Clayton seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Yes
Commissioner Conder	Absent
Commissioner Fuller	Absent
Commissioner Lang	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous – Z-10-2007 – approved

Z-11-2007

Richmond American Homes

4450 South 2700 West

A to R-1-6

15.6 acres

Mr. Steve Pastorik presented the application.

Richmond American Homes has requested a zone change for a 15.6 acre parcel at 4450 South 2700 West from A (agriculture, minimum lot size of ½ acre) to R-1-6 (single family residential, minimum lot size 6,000 square feet). Surrounding zones include R-1-8 to the north, R-2-8 to the west, A to the south and A-1 to the east in Taylorsville. Adjacent uses include single family homes to the north and west, UDOT’s driver training course to the south, and a UDOT office complex to the east in Taylorsville. The subject property is designated as office or medium density residential (6 to 10 units to the acre) in the West Valley City General Plan.

Development Proposal

The conceptual subdivision layout submitted by Richmond American, which is included as Figure 2 in the attached development agreement proposal entitled “The Seasons at Constitution”, indicates a total of 118 small, courtyard type single family lots where four homes share a common driveway. The proposed density is 7.56 units/acre, which would be a planned unit development (PUD) in the R-1-6 Zone.

In addition to the development agreement, there are three other attachments included with this report. The first is a two page response from Richmond American to the questions listed on the zone change application. The second is a short packet entitled “Richmond

American ‘Courtyard’ Product” that lists densities and provides photos of other similar developments that Richmond has completed. The architecture proposed for the subject property is closest to the project in Riverton. The third is plan view of the proposed courtyard configuration for this project compared to the courtyard configuration used by Richmond American on other similar projects.

Development Agreement

A development agreement is required for this project. Section 7-14-105 (3)(l)(x) of the West Valley City Zoning Ordinance states: “All new subdivisions involving a rezone of property, or a PUD, shall participate in a development agreement that addresses housing size, quality, exterior finish materials, streetscapes, landscaping, etc. The standards outlined in Section 7-14-105 (3)(l)(iii) shall be used as a minimum in all development agreements to address housing quality and exterior finish materials. These standards may be increased for a PUD. As part of a development agreement, if homes are permitted with less than 1,600 square feet of finished floor space, the quality of the home and the amount of masonry exterior finish materials shall be increased. For the entire subdivision, the average shall be at least 1,600 square feet.”

As mentioned above, the applicant has submitted the attached development agreement proposal entitled “The Seasons at Constitution.” After reviewing this proposed development agreement, staff has several suggested changes that are listed below following the same order of the development agreement:

1. Introduction

This section states that the streets will be public streets. Staff suggests that the agreement allow streets to be either public or private. Since private streets are typically narrower, they would allow more room for yard space; however, they would reduce on-street parking capacity resulting in a need for more designated visitor parking.

1.3 Conceptual Site Plan

To allow more room for private yard space and common open space, staff suggests limiting the number of units to 110 and removing the two east/west running streets in the center of project closest to the open space. This would result in a density of about 7.1 units/acre, which is what was recently approved for Hamlet Development for a similar type of development. Since staff is recommending fewer units and engineered plans accounting for topography and storm drainage have not been reviewed at this point, references to specific acreages and percentages of open space should be removed so that these items can be adequately addressed during the preliminary plat process. Additional information will be needed and more evaluation will occur at the preliminary plat stage that could significantly impact the site plan.

Along 2700 West the standard 5' sidewalk and 5' parkstrip is proposed. 2700 West is a busy street that normally would see greater setbacks for homes. Staff recommends that, at a minimum, an additional 5' be added west of the sidewalk to provide a landscaped strip between the sidewalk and fence similar to what has been done at Hunter Village along 3500 South and at Stonegate along 3100 South.

Figure 2 should be amended to reflect these changes as well as other changes that are described below.

1.4 Standard Street Cross Section

Once again, staff recommends that the agreement allow for both public or private streets. The final determination would be made during the preliminary plat process. For the front yard setback, staff suggests reducing this setback to allow more room in the rear yard. The exact amount of the reduction would need to be resolved during the preliminary plat since there could be a conflict with utilities if the front setback is too small.

3.1 Site Development Standards Table

Minimum lot area: Through the concept plan changes discussed above, the minimum lot area could be increased slightly.

Minimum Front Yard Setback: To allow more rear yard space, staff suggests that the front setback for all homes along the street to be reduced to a number that will not cause problems with utilities or clear view standards for private driveways. The exact number can be determined during the subdivision process.

Minimum Side Yard Setbacks: Homes on corner lots must meet minimum clear view standards.

Minimum Rear Yard Setback: Staff recommends a minimum rear yard setback of 15'. This would allow more room for recreation and create space for a small patio and a small storage shed. The setback for patio covers could be reduced to 9'.

Minimum Living Area: The minimum house size for a multi-level in the ordinance is 1,600 square feet. However, the ordinance does allow in a PUD a home less than 1,600 square feet if the overall average is at least 1,600 square feet and the quality of the homes and the amount of masonry exterior finish materials is increased.

For this project, there are four house plans with finished areas of 1,576, 1,581, 1,749, and 2,001 square feet. The resulting average is over 1,700 square feet.

100% masonry exteriors are proposed and the number of points achieved through the City's point system exceeds the minimum number points required for every house plan. Staff recommends that Table 1 include a minimum average of 1,700 square feet.

Another ordinance requirement to consider is the following: "For homes without basements, the minimum house size shall be increased by 100 square feet and the minimum garage size shall be increased to 24 feet by 24 feet or other storage arrangements shall be made as negotiated in a development agreement." The intent of this ordinance was to create more storage space for homes without basements. According to the applicant, basements are not proposed. Two of the four house plans proposed meet the increased house size. To staff's knowledge, none of the homes would have a 24' x 24' garage. Staff proposes the following options to meet this ordinance requirement:

1. Basements shall be provided on all homes.
2. Basements shall be provided on some of the homes. Homes without basements must meet item 4, 5, 6, or 7 below.
3. No homes have basements and all homes must meet item 4, 5, 6, or 7 below.
4. The minimum house size shall be 1,700 square feet and the minimum garage size shall be 24' x 24'.
5. The minimum house size shall be 1,750 square feet and the developer shall provide an 80 square foot storage shed in the rear yard.
6. The minimum garage size shall be 24' x 24' and the developer shall provide an 80 square foot storage shed in the rear yard.
7. The minimum house size shall be 1,850 square feet.

3.2 Porches, Decks and Overhangs

Staff recommends that uncovered decks be offered as an upgrade with this development.

3.3 Accessory Buildings

Staff recommends that a small shed no more than 80 square feet be allowed in the rear yard for storage. Such sheds should meet the standards outlined for accessory buildings in the R-1 Zones.

4.1 Style and Character

Figures 4 – 11 are the proposed front, side and rear elevations of the four house plans. According to the applicant, only one front elevation is being offered for each house plan. Often, home builders will offer two or three alternative front elevations for the same floor plan to provide variety. Staff recommends that at least one alternative elevation be submitted for each of the four house plans. These alternative elevations should be reviewed by the Planning Commission in a study

session before the rezone request is forwarded to the City Council.

Staff also recommends the following enhancements to the proposed elevations:

- All homes should have a full perimeter stone wainscot.
- All windows and doors should have either stucco trim or header and sill.
- The rear elevations of the spring and summer plans should include a relief element like a bay or box window, foundation jog, second floor cantilevered space, or small covered patio especially along 2700 West.

4.2 Architectural Requirements

Table 2 shown is almost identical to the table used in the City's design standards ordinance with a few minor exceptions. For ease of administration, staff suggests that the project use the same table outlined in the City's ordinance.

The applicant has included in Table 2 the estimated number of points achieved by each house plan. After a review of Table 2, staff noticed several areas where the point assessment should probably be changed. Staff can meet with the applicant to correct or resolve these discrepancies before the rezone request is forwarded to the City Council.

Table 3 would apply to homes that have either a side or rear elevation that faces a street. Since each of the sides and the rear of the homes will potentially need to be evaluated for their compliance with these standards when next to a street, either three tables should be provided with scoring for each elevation except the front or the scoring should be removed.

5.2 Required Installation

Landscaping installed by Richmond American should include automatic irrigation systems. Richmond American should also be responsible for landscaping along 2700 West and in all parkstrips. The type of landscaping to be installed should be determined during the subdivision process. A landscape plan should be required.

5.3 Minimum Requirements

Staff recommends that the CC&R's include a provision that prohibits landscaping in parkstrips to be removed and/or replaced with hardscape such as concrete or asphalt. This provision would be enforced by the homeowner's association.

5.5 Maintenance

The applicant mentioned that installation and maintenance of landscaping in rear yards would be the homeowner's responsibility. This section should be changed to reflect this.

6.2 Street, Roadways and Crosswalks

Once again, staff recommends private streets as an option. If the streets are public, snow from the courtyard drive areas should not be dumped onto public streets.

6.4 Fencing

The ordinance requires a masonry wall along 2700 West except where an acceptable alternative is approved by the Planning Commission. The type of fencing installed along 2700 West should be determined during the subdivision review process. Also, fencing along 2700 West and in common areas should be maintained by the homeowner's association.

Other Suggestions

In addition to the suggestions listed above, staff has other suggestions that aren't specifically addressed in the proposed development agreement. These suggestions are:

- Include an entrance feature at the main entrance of the project.
- Include language used in other recent development agreements concerning the transfer of maintenance responsibility of common area improvements from the developer to the homeowner's association.

Three other items that should be addressed during the subdivision review are: visitor parking, exploring the possibility of having both homes in the courtyard design that are closest to the street face the street (under the current plan, only one faces the street), and further evaluating the use of the steep slopes along the north and west sides of the property.

Applicant:

Mr. Jim Delahunty
4179 South Riverboat Rd.

Favored:

Steve Martin
4445 S. Roxborough

Concerned:

Tom Sollis
4238 King Arthur

Discussion: Mr. Jim Delahunty was concerned about staff's recommendations for 110 units instead of 118, and asked why that specific number was determined. Steve Pastorik explained that staff would like larger rear yards and more open space. He said this could be done with the reduction of some lots. Mr. Delahunty perceived they could still meet the City's requirements and General Plan regulations, and he does not want to be limited to 110 homes. He agrees some units will be lost, but he wants the option of building more homes than 110 if possible. Mr. Delahunty noted they planned on having public streets not private streets. He listed the advantages of public streets, stating they are wider, there is landscaping on both sides, and they are built to City standards. He reported he has built many PUD's, and it is best if the streets are the City's standard. Mr. Delahunty mentioned if the proposed HOA was to ever go bankrupt, the road would be non-standard, and the City would have to take over the road maintenance. Commissioner

Matheson asked if the reason the applicant wants public streets is because there is no visitor parking available. Mr. Delahunty answered yes, although visitor parking could be provided if required. He commented traditional subdivisions do not provide visitor parking because of the public streets which allow parallel parking while still allowing emergency access for fire trucks. Commissioner Lang asked who removes the snow and where will it be stored in the winter. Mr. Delahunty stated the snow removal will be 100% the responsibility of the home owners association. It would not be pushed into the private streets, but will be pushed into the courtyard areas and into the frontyard setbacks. He would hate to lose the public streets only to gain some rear yard space.

Mr. Delahunty had an additional concern regarding the minimum rearyard setback. He noted staff is recommending 15-feet, and the applicant is proposing 10-feet. Mr. Delahunty asked the Commission to compromise around the 12.5-foot range for rearyard setbacks. He said this would increase the size of the lots upwards to 30%. This will result in the elimination of 2 to 2.5 lots to the acre. Mr. Delahunty redrew a sight plan showing 12.5-ft. rearyards, going from 118 units to 113 units. Rather than the half-acre courtyard in the middle, it has been enlarged to 1.14 acres, while still keeping the open space along the trail. He reported that with the trails and the 1.14 open park in the center, there is a total of 3.52 acres of dedicated open space, which is 22.5% of the site. This does not include the private backyards, parkstrips or roads.

Steve Pastorik commented that the issue regarding private verses public streets will not be determined until the plat is approved. He would like this issue left open at this stage of the application. Steve discussed the walkway that runs in between the lots in the center of the site, running north and south through the park. Steve said that space is approximately 30-feet, and if that space is eliminated and divided up into the backyards, it would create larger backyards. Mr. Delahunty agreed that this would work well east and west, but not north and south, as it provides less active open space for the community. He mentioned they start to lose units with the 15-ft. rear yard, so 12.5 is a compromise. Commissioner Clayton asked if the back yards would be fenced in between the narrow corridor. Mr. Delahunty said the proposed fencing is a six-foot solid vinyl privacy fence, but through the open space areas, a rod iron fence is planned to keep the area open. Commissioner Clayton asked how the trail will be incorporate on the hillside. Mr. Delahunty reminded that the topography report has not yet been completed. They plan to place the fence on the bottom of the hill. He does not want to re-grade the site, so they plan to place a meandering trail on top of the hill. As the trail moves to the south or east, a retaining wall may be required to hold up the trail. They plan to asphalt the trail resulting in very little maintenance.

Mr. Delahunty told the Commission that Richmond American Home's largest concern is the house size that staff is recommending. He mentioned units two and three have been increased in size, adding approximately 80 to 100-sq. ft. to each house. This will also

break up the back of the flat houses. Chairman Woodruff asked if the house arrangements are set. Mr. Delahunty replied yes, stating each pod that is viewed will be built, and that is all that will be available. He noted staff is recommended increased storage capacity, but said the architectural standards are already being increased. Mr. Delahunty informed the market price will be approximately \$240,000.00. He requested consideration with staff's suggestion for additional storage space.

Mr. Delahunty said staff has also recommended a different elevation for the homes, at least one elevation that could be picked from. He mentioned this is not typically standard for this type of development, stating condos and smaller developments look the same as you go through them. Mr. Delahunty asked for leniency regarding this request.

The last issue that Mr. Delahunty had regarding staff's suggestions was about the full perimeter stone wainscot. He said that in the rear yard there is a six-foot fence in front of the wainscot, so the wainscot will not be viewed.

Commissioner Clayton asked if basements would be built. Mr. Delahunty replied that due to constructability and the size of the homes with the close proximity, basements are not feasible. Excavation and window wells meeting fire code create too many problems, so basements are not offered. Commissioner Clayton noted other developments by Richmond Homes have basements. Mr. Delahunty explained Richmond purchased those homes, and the basements were placed before purchased by Richmond. He stated there were many code problems as well as utilities running around the perimeter of the houses. Commissioner Lang asked if the problems would be eliminated with the larger set-backs. Mr. Delahunty said no, as gas, power, and telephone lines must be placed around the houses. The larger setbacks are in the rear yards, not in the front yards. He said the window wells will affect the unit close to the property line, creating code issues. Chairman Woodruff suggested the foundation be placed in all at once. Mr. Delahunty answered this would not work, as their corporate office will not approve basements. He commented if you sell the first three pods, there is no room for the dirt for the forth pod. It is difficult to get the last two sections of the pods in, creating constructability issues. Commissioner Matheson mentioned the recent bad press regarding Richmond American Home's concrete work. Mr. Delahunty explained they purchased concrete in bulk two years ago. Since that time, issues have been resolved and the subcontractor will donate concrete if Richmond donates the labor to repair problems. Chairman Woodruff liked the direction of latest site plan, stating it is an improvement over the first plan. Steve suggested the issues be resolved at this point. He said if there are other items that can wait until subdivision approval, those items can be left out of the development agreement to keep the options open. Chairman Woodruff suggested a continuance to review the application at a future Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Lang wants the units to have basements which will make them large enough to be long-term rather than starter homes. Commissioner Clayton agreed that the Commission needs more time to

discuss the issues. Commissioner Lang suggested shifting the homes, and then possibly the utilities would be easier to place with basements. She mentioned there is so much transitional housing in this area that it would make sense to have homes that could accommodate larger families. Mr. Delahunty reported that the residents of Roxborough are long-term, and those units do not have basements. He believes the units will not be transitional, stating there is a large market for this type of unit. Commissioner Lang asked who would maintain the rear yards. Mr. Delahunty said the home owners would maintain the rear yards, but the front yard and open space will be maintained by the HOA. Commissioner Lang suggested the rear yard would not be large enough to mow. Mr. Delahunty stated the rear yards could be used for a small garden or shed. He informed that many people want small yards with little maintenance. Commissioner Matheson confirmed that the 24 X 24 garages are not being proposed. Mr. Delahunty said this is correct. The homes are proposed at the size displayed, but Steve has made some requirements towards providing storage sheds. He assured Richmond is not opposed to providing storage, but there are concerns about spacing. Mr. Delahunty explained they would want the sheds seven-feet or below so that they would not be viewed behind the fences. Fire issues could also be a concern, since sheds are most likely to have a fire.

Mr. Steve Martin, who lives at Roxborough, was representing himself and also on behalf of the management of Roxborough. He is in favor of this development believing it will work better than other proposed developments. Mr. Martin does not consider these units as affordable income housing or transient housing. He suggested if the same homes were placed on larger lots, they would be priced at \$350,000.00. He believes this development will not degrade, but will increase the value of homes in the area. Mr. Martin liked the idea of wider streets to accommodate parking. He was in favor of the trail, but was concerned about weeds growing on the hillside. Mr. Martin suggested this development will support the redevelopment of commercial in this area. He was concerned the water table would make basements impossible. Commissioner Clayton asked if there are shared services at Roxborough. Mr. Martin replied yes, areas are maintained by the HOA, however all individual properties are maintained with CC&R's.

Mr. Tom Sollis lives on King Arthur Drive and he asked about noticing, wondering if more residents would be told of this application. He was concerned about sheds creating a fire problem. He suggested fill could be added if needed to place basements in the units.

Commissioner Matheson was not sure about the concept of shared driveways. He explained problems including being able to utilize a driveway for any other use than a driveway. Commissioner Matheson stated residents must pull their vehicles into their own units. He perceived vehicles will continue to park on the streets. Commissioner Matheson said visitor parking is needed, and should be discussed further. Commissioner Clayton agreed that this application should be continued.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Clayton moved for a continuance.

Commissioner Lang seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Yes
Commissioner Conder	Absent
Commissioner Fuller	Absent
Commissioner Lang	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous – Z-11-2007 – continued

CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION:

C-14-2007

Harmans' Towing

2923 S. 3600 W.

M-Zone 2.52 Acres

Mr. Ron Weibel presented the application.

The applicant is requesting a conditional use amendment to modify one of the conditions from a previous conditional use approval. This site is located in a manufacturing zone (M) on 2.52 acres of land. It is bordered on the north and south by M zoning, on the west across 3600 W. by C-2 zoning and on the east by R-1-4 zoning. The West Valley City General Plan designates this property light manufacturing.

On January 29, 2003 the West Valley City Planning Commission approved application #C-1-2003 for an expansion of an existing impound yard. One of the conditions of that approval was that by January 29, 2008 an existing modular trailer used as an office would

be removed and replaced by a permanent building. Due to circumstances outlined in an attached letter the applicant does not feel that he can meet that condition.

The applicant is requesting an extension of twenty (20) months, until September 2009, to complete the building and remove the temporary office trailer. A timeline to complete that requirement has been submitted and a copy of that timeline is included in the packet. The information submitted also indicates that when they build the permanent office they would like part of it dedicated as a private dwelling to allow for on-site 24 hour security. The manufacturing zone allows this as an accessory use, however the applicant will need to submit elevations and floor plans at a later date for the Planning Commission to review in a future study session.

The landscaping has been intermittently maintained on this site and the property owner needs to make sure that all required landscaping is permanently maintained and that all vacant areas be kept free of weeds.

Applicant:

Becky Beck

2923 S. 3600 W.

Discussion: Chairman Woodruff asked what would happen to the applicant if the Commission did not approve this application for an extension. Ron Weibel replied that the applicant will still have until January 2008 to construct their building. He said if this application is not approved, and the applicant does not build their building, it would become an enforcement issue. Commissioner Matheson asked if the building is necessary for the business. Ron replied the building is required by Planning and Zoning Division as well as the Police Department because it's on their impound yard rotation list. Commissioner Matheson confirmed that if the applicant misses this building season opportunity, it would be next spring before a building could be placed. Ron assured this was correct, if this application is not approved, the applicant would need to have a building placed on the property by January 2008.

Ms. Becky Beck is the wife of Kevin Beck who is the owner of Harman's Towing. She said the plans are in the works, and if this application is denied, they would have to downsize the business. Ms. Beck explained there are no sewer lines that run down 3600 West. A neighboring business tapped into a back residence for sewer. She said this issue is resulting in extra cost and time which is the only thing keeping the building from being constructed. They planned for an office where someone could live for security reasons. Their current financial situation would require a downsizing of their business if they must construct the building at this time. Commissioner Clayton asked if another business is

being operated in the rear of the property. Ms. Beck answered yes. She said Harman's Towing owns the land, and Beck's accountant suggested the towing be split from the property. Ron Weibel asked if the applicant has started working with Granger Hunter Improvement District for sewer. Ms. Beck answered yes. She said the worse case scenario will be crossing the street, costing thousands of dollars if neighbors will not cooperate. Ron asked Ms. Beck if there has been any discussion regarding easements through the adjacent property. Ms. Beck answered no, she does not know which adjacent property might be the best option for an easement. Mr. Clayton verified that the 20-month extension is the best case scenario to resolve this issue. Ms. Beck perceived a 20-month extension is a realistic estimate. Ron confirmed the new due date with the 20-month extension would be Sept. 29, 2009. Chairman Woodruff perceived the City would not be worse off by giving the applicant this extension. Commissioner Matheson did not want to create a hardship for a long term business of West Valley City, such as this business.

Ms. Beck asked about the exterior of the building, stating their neighbor has siding. She noted that Kevin Hooper's only concern was that the building not be metal. Ron informed that the type of exterior for the building was not a condition of approval. He assured staff could work with the applicant regarding this issue. Ms. Beck mentioned they have had their landscaping performed by a professional and it has improved the businesses appearance, per the request of the City.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Lang moved for approval subject to the resolution of any concerns raised at the public hearing, as well as the following conditions:

1. The permanent office building shall be completed no later than September 29, 2009. Plans for this building, including any proposed residence, shall be submitted for Planning Commission review no later than January, 2009.
2. Landscaping shall be properly maintained and weeds in unimproved areas shall be controlled.
3. All signage shall comply with West Valley City ordinances.

Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Yes
Commissioner Conder	Absent
Commissioner Fuller	Absent
Commissioner Lang	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous – C-14-2007 – approved

PLANNING COMISSION BUSINESS

Approval of minutes from April 25, 2007 (Regular Meeting) **Continued**
Approval of minutes from May 2, 2007 (Study Session) **Continued**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Cannon, Administrative Assistant